

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. 1, 8, and 15 are the independent claims.

Claim 15 has been amended to improve its idiomatic English form. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0171774 (Lee et al.). Claims 2, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,323,298 (Shatas et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, a sub-case detachably connected to a main case ... and blocking electromagnetic interference between a video board and an electronic circuit components.

Independent claim 8 recites, inter alia, a sub-case, detachably connected to a main case, that prevents electromagnetic interference between a video board and an electronic circuit components

Independent claim 15 recites, inter alia, a sub-case, housing a video board, detachably flush mounted ... and preventing electromagnetic interference

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee et al. does not teach at least the aforementioned features, for at least the following reasons. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Shatas et al. does not remedy this deficiency.

Lee et al. relates to a display apparatus and a tuner mounted therein and discusses an arrangement including a TV tuner unit 50 mounted in a TV tuner accommodating part 21 of a rear cover 20. (Lee et al., FIG. 4). As the Office Action emphasizes, the TV tuner unit 50 is detachably attached to the rear cover 20. (Office Action, page 2).

A review of FIG. 4 of Lee et al. reveals, however, no teaching of a sub-case as defined by independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Thus, Lee et al. cannot anticipate these claims.

Firstly, although Lee et al. may teach that the TV tuner unit 50 is "detachably attached" to the rear cover 20, this is not what is claimed. Indeed, a review of the aforementioned features shows that it is a sub-case that is defined as being detachably connected to a main case (claims

1 and 8) or detachably flush mounted (claim 15).

Secondly, the Office Action emphasis, at page 3, of Lee et al.'s teaching at paragraph [0041] that when the TV tuner unit 50 is inserted into the TV tuner accommodating unit 21 "harmful electromagnetic waves generated from TV tuner unit 50 can be removed" is inapposite. A review of the aforementioned features shows that it is the sub-case that is defined as blocking electromagnetic interference. And, the claims define the sub-case as being detachably connected (claims 1 and 8) or detachably flush mounted (claim 15). Thus, to meet the aforementioned features, the TV tuner accommodating part 21 must be at least detachable. But, Lee et al. does not teach that TV accommodating part 21 is detachable. Indeed, a review of FIG. 4 of Lee et al. shows that TV accommodating part 21 is a recess of the rear cover. It is submitted that a recess alone cannot be detachable.

And, if the Office contends that the TV tuner's detachability is enough to support his rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that such detachability cannot be imparted on the structure that blocks or prevent electromagnetic radiation.

Lastly, even assuming, arguendo, that the casing 53, which forms a housing with casing 54 to accommodate TV tuner 51 (Lee et al., Fig. 5) is a sub-casing, Lee et al. does not teach or suggest that casings 53 or 54 block electromagnetic radiation.

Thus, Lee et al. does not anticipate independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the secondary citation to Shatas et al. relates to an integral enclosure and shield for EMI radiating circuitry and is cited for its alleged disclosures of various features of dependent claims 1, 10, and 12. It is submitted that Shatas et al. does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency in Lee et al.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such

matters.


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-13-07

By: 
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501